## GENERAL PLAN 2020 Planning Commission Schedule

**DAY 1 • JANUARY 31, 2003** 

Planning Area	Subarea
North Mountain	Palomar Mountain
Desert	Borrego Springs
Julian	
Central Mountain	Cuyamaca
	Pine Valley
	Descanso
Mountain Empire	Jacumba
	Boulevard
	Lake Morena/Campo
	Potrero

## **NORTH MOUNTAIN**

North Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 2,467 Community 2020 Target: 3,779 Working Copy Population: 5,250

## **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 3 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Protection of natural resources.
- Maintaining potential for agricultural uses.
- Equity mechanism for retaining property value.
- Recognition of existing commercial property.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No application of Village Core or Village categories due to lack of existing development pattern, desire to limit growth, and the Forest Conservation Initiative.
- Semi-Rural development recognized where a cohesive pattern exists.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Location (inefficient for infrastructure development) and environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Recognized existing communities.
- Recognized significant existing commercial development.
- Preserved land for potential larger scale agricultural uses by maintaining 40 acre and lower densities

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 114 persons

- Application of lowest density in very biologically constrained areas.
- Minimal recognition of existing development pattern.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

Tsubarea does not include group quarters

## PALOMAR MOUNTAIN

North Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 245 Community 2020 Target: 871 Working Copy Population: 500

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 3 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Protection of natural resources.
- Recognition of existing commercial property.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No application of Village Core, Village, or Semi-Rural categories due to lack of existing development pattern, desire to limit growth, and the Forest Conservation Initiative (1993).
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Location (inefficient for infrastructure development) and environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Recognized significant existing commercial development.
- Preserved land for potential larger scale agricultural uses by maintaining one dwelling unit per forty acre and lower densities.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• While this area has no official representation, the Palomar Mountain Planning Organization would like to see additional density and commercially designated parcels on Palomar Mountain. This option is precluded by the density restrictions placed on the area as a result of the Forest Conservation Initiative (1993).

 $<sup>\</sup>overline{\phantom{a}}$  subarea does not include group quarters

## **DESERT**

## Desert Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 608 Community 2020 Target: 2,079 Working Copy Population: 1,400

### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED:**

- Groundwater overdraft. More than 5 times the amount of water that goes into the aquifer is taken out.
- Groundwater dependent. There is no imported water in the subregion.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, flood danger, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization. Water is the major determining factor for growth. Most of the private in-holdings within the State Park lack access.
- Public/semi-public the majority of the land in the Desert Subregion is owned and managed by the State Park.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Majority of the subregion lacks access.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## **BORREGO SPRINGS**

Desert Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 2,582 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 12,000 Working Copy Population: 13,750

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 15 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Groundwater overdraft. More than 5 times the amount of water that goes into the aquifer is taken out.
- Groundwater dependent. The entire valley is reliant on the aquifer under the Borrego valley. Piping water in would be too expensive. There is no imported water in the subregion.
- High water users agriculture (15,500 acre-feet per year) along with golf courses and commercial landscaping (4,400 acre-feet per year) make up 90% of the valley's annual water use.
- The Sponsor Group would like a moratorium on any conversion of land to agriculture in the area.
- Land that is graded does not naturally re-vegetate because of the desert environment. This leads to air pollution (frequent dust storms).
- Approximately 5,000 vacant parcels in the Borrego Valley.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

### **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses generally reflect the current pattern of development and parcelization. Sewer and water is available through the local water district. Infrastructure (schools, parks, library, fire and police protection) is in place.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect uses and existing patterns of development and parcelization. Infrastructure is in place.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, flood danger, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization. Water is the major determining factor for growth. Most of the private in-holdings within the State Park lack access.

• Public/semi-public – the majority of the land in the Desert Subregion is owned and managed by the State Park. The Borrego Valley is surrounded by the Anza-Borrego State Park.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Infrastructure availability:
  - Water and Sewer availability
  - Access the western portion of the valley has an existing road network. The majority of the subregion lacks access
  - Schools, fire and police protection, etc.
- Land in agricultural uses generally designated 1 du/20 ac.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

#### ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• One area in the northwest portion of the Borrego Valley is proposed by the sponsor group to change from 1 du/20 ac (all of the land in the 1 du/20 ac designation) to 1 du/4 ac with the intent of providing greater flexibility for agricultural landowners to pursue land uses that have a lesser impact on groundwater depletion, thus lowering the overdraft on the aquifer.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## JULIAN

## Julian Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 3,104 Community 2020 Target<sup>1</sup>: 3,100 Working Copy Population: 4,200

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 9 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Area is limited by septic and groundwater. Most of the area's current systems are near or at capacity. Many wells in the area are going dry.
- Lack of parking the town is dependent on tourism. During October, November, snow days, and weekends there is not enough parking to accommodate visitors. It is also a safety issue.
- Circulation possible bypass road to avoid the center of town. High traffic on weekends and during the busy season.
- Steep slopes.
- Ridgeline preservation.
- Sensitive habitat
- Maintaining agriculture.
- Impacts to community character from new development.
- Many lots are not buildable due to small sizes (Harrison Park).

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

### **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities match the existing land use without further expanding the current core area.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between communities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 173 persons

• The Interest Group designated a large area at 1du/80 ac that the planning group has recommended be designated 1du/40 acres.

## Planning Group:

- The planning group is re-evaluating the 1du/40 ac rural density in the area the Interest Group has recommended as 1du/80 ac. Staff will agree to support a recommendation of 1du/80 ac if the planning group votes to change the density.
- The planning group is re-evaluating the target population.

<sup>1</sup> community target established prior to 2000 census data

## **CENTRAL MOUNTAIN**

## Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 7
Community 2020 Target: ---

Working Copy Population: 150

### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED:**

- Preserve the environment.
- Retain the existing setting and rural atmosphere.
- Protect regionally significant resources.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

 Rural areas dominate the subregion. Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and a lack of infrastructure. Cleveland National Forest is also predominant, which also limits development.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

• Low densities have been applied to Forest Conservation Initiative lands. No density applied to lands considered 'no jurisdiction' (tribal lands, public lands).

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## **CUYAMACA**

## Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 377 Community 2020 Target: 680 Working Copy Population: 600

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 17 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Preserve and maintain the environment and open space.
- Preserve rural quality of life.
- Protect regionally significant resources.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No Village Core or Village densities exist in the subregion.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing pattern of development.
- Rural areas dominate the subregion. Approximately 95% of the subregion is comprised of the Cuyamaca Rancho State Park or the Cleveland National Forest, which also limits development.

- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Low densities applied to Forest Conservation Initiative lands. No density applied to lands considered 'no jurisdiction' (tribal lands, public lands).
- Large parcel sizes surrounded by public land determined low density patterns.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## **DESCANSO**

## Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 1,742 Community 2020 Target: 2,274 Working Copy Population: 2,800

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 15 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Provide adequate access to open space.
- Encourage the preservation of a rural character, ranchlands.
- Maintain an agricultural/ranching lifestyle.
- Preserve environmental resources.
- Lack of water.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No Village Core densities exist in the subregion.
- Village densities reflect parcelization.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing pattern of development.
- Rural areas dominate the subregion. Rural designation reflects environmental constraints and goal to maintain open space and rural atmosphere.

- Defined country town boundary. All lands outside of the country town are located in the Forest Conservation Initiative.
- Low-density designations reflect community concern of lack of water and environmental constraints (slope, floodplain, etc.)
- Low-density designations applied to Forest Conservation Initiative lands. No density applied to lands considered 'no jurisdiction' (tribal lands, public lands).
- Attempt to retain existing setting and rural atmosphere.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning Group:

- Retain existing general plan.
- Underlying densities of Forest Conservation Initiative lands should be recognized in the new general plan.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## PINE VALLEY

## Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 2,329 Community 2020 Target: 3,613 Working Copy Population: 2,700

## **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 14 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Limit traffic on circulation routes.
- Maintain the rural character of the subregion.
- Preserve environmental resources such as wildlife, forest lands/trails, open space.

## CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No Village Core densities exist in subregion.
- Village densities are reflected by the existing pattern of development.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing pattern of development within the country town.
- Rural areas inside the country town are located in areas with steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and/or lack of water or other infrastructure.
   Parcel sizes and dwelling units recognized within the village. Parcel sizes reflect lower densities outside of the village.
- Cleveland National Forest and Forest Conservation Initiative dictated areas kept at low density or areas out of County jurisdiction.

- Lack of water district service dictates decreased densities in areas that are undeveloped within existing country town.
- Environmental constraints (particularly lack of groundwater, and floodplain to the north) determined density patterns within village. Outside of village, parcel size determined densities.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified.

Tsubarea does not include group quarters

## MOUNTAIN EMPIRE

## Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 101 Community 2020 Target: 361 Working Copy Population: 250

#### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED:**

- Allow for 1 du/20 ac density in lands adjacent to existing infrastructure.
- Maintaining agriculture intensity.

#### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

• Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 20- and 40-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development and individual requests.

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 34 persons* 

• Two areas surrounded by National Forest and Tribal Lands are proposed by the Interest Group to be changed from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/80 ac due to lack of existing parcelization and biological resources.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## **JACUMBA**

## Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 660 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 5,000 Working Copy Population: 3,400

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 8 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Allow for commercial and residential development to support the existing village of Jacumba.
- Maintaining rural character without impeding potential growth.

#### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing and historic development patterns of the village of Jacumba.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing residential uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Village/Semi-Rural densities due to the need to revitalize the historic Village area.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure, and existing parcelization.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between private and public lands.
- Recognized existing patterns of development in the village area.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 18 persons

• The Interest Group proposes to change the community's preferred density of 1 du/20 ac and 1 du/40 ac to 1 du/80 ac and 1 du/160 ac due to lack of existing parcelization and biological resources.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified except the 1/20 or 1/40 acre Rural Lands Density preference. Recommend Working Copy December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

• Jacumba Valley Ranch is shown on the Working Copy – December 2002 map, however, the area will be revised with consideration of the Board of Supervisor action taken on January 18, 2003.

## **BOULEVARD**

## Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 1,513 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 4,134 Working Copy Population: 2,850

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 4 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Rural character opens unique opportunities for the many recreational possibilities surrounding the area.
- Boulevard's natural resources are a valuable asset to its own quality of life, as well as the region.
- Commercial needs are satisfied by small businesses that work to maintain the common personality of the area. The new Casino gives rise to the issue of expanding the existing Village Core and commercial areas.
- Maintain the existing rural character.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

### **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing crossroads of Highway 80, Highway 94, Ribbonwood Road and Interstate 8.
- Semi-Rural areas primarily reinforce the village areas.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure, and existing parcelization. Growth would predominantly occur in the Rural densities due to area predominately being designated Rural Lands.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between the communities of Tierra del Sol, Boulevard and Live Oak Springs.
- Preserved land for open space uses by maintaining 20- and 40-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 143 persons

Recommends 1 du/80 ac to 1 du/160 ac in the northern portion of the sponsor group area. The planning group accepts 1 du/40 ac in this area.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified. Recommend Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

subarea does not include group quarters community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## LAKE MORENA/CAMPO

## Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 2,679 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 4,640 Working Copy Population: 5,000

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 8 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- The residents of the Lake Morena/Campo sponsor group area live there for the rural atmosphere and wish to maintain it.
- Plan should reflect the existing parcelization and community character.
- Limited growth should be targeted at the Cameron Corners village area.
- Any growth, residential or commercial, should maintain the existing rural character.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in and around Cameron Corners at Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road. Growth would predominantly occur in the village areas due to lack of sewer availability.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development and parcelization.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, lack of infrastructure, and parcelization.

- Environmental constraints, infrastructure availability, and recognizing existing parcelization determined density patterns.
- Buffers have been established between communities.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 937 persons

• The Interest Group proposed to change the 1 du/20 ac and 1 du/40 ac as designated on Alternative III to 1 du/80 ac and 1 du/160 ac due to lack of existing parcelization and large existing blocks of biological resources.

## **Sponsor Group (as of January 2003):**

- Recommend Working Copy December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement of the village area. No major changes from the Alternative III Map (the Board of Supervisors allowed Lake Morena-Campo to keep their Alternative III Map in January 2000), and the Planning Group wishes to maintain the lowest densities allowed in Alternative III of 1 du/20 ac and 1 du/40 ac instead of the Interest Group recommendation of 1 du/80 ac and 1 du/160 ac.
- Allow Cameron Corners to be a village with appropriate densities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## **POTRERO**

## Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 886 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 1,525 Working Copy Population: 2,150

## KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 6 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Potrero is a self-determination community and is mostly satisfied with the existing General Plan designations.
- Physical, historic structures in Potrero not only contribute to the "country-life" feel of the area, but also to its sentimental appeal and strong roots.
- Commercial needs are satisfied by small businesses and services that work to maintain the common personality of the area.
- Potrero's rural quality provides the community with various unique opportunities for recreation and leisure, while also helping to form its distinct character.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing crossroads area at Highway 94 and Potrero Road.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and existing parcelization along the areas main roadway framework.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between private and public lands to the north.
- Preserved land for agricultural and residential uses by maintaining 10- and 20- acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 658 persons

The Interest Group proposes to change existing residential from Semi-Rural (1 du/10 ac or lower) to Rural Lands (1 du/80 acres) due to lack of existing parcelization and regional location.

## **Planning Group:**

• Possible recommendation for the Working Copy – December 2002 map to be accepted for further testing and refinement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters <sup>2</sup> community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## GENERAL PLAN 2020 Planning Commission Schedule

## **DAY 2 • FEBRUARY 7, 2003**

Planning Area	Subarea
Pendleton-Deluz	
Otay	
County Islands	
Rainbow	
Fallbrook	
Pala-Pauma	
Bonsall	
North County Metro	Hidden Meadows
	Twin Oaks
San Dieguito	
Valley Center	
Ramona	

## PENDLETON-DELUZ

## Pendleton-DeLuz Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 36,927 Community 2020 Target<sup>1</sup>: 34,976 Working Copy Population: 38,350

### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED:**

- Over 75% of the planning area is under the jurisdiction of the military (Camp Pendleton) with the vast majority of the area population located on base.
- Preservation of agriculture.
- Lack of services.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- There are no Village Core or Village densities within the Pendleton-DeLuz Planning area due to the lack of services and remoteness of the area.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Growth not directed to areas without supporting or planned infrastructure such as roads, fire protection, schools and parks.
- Preserved land with rugged terrain and sensitive biological habitats by maintaining 20- and 40-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Santa Margarita River, upland habitats and watershed.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 142 persons

• One area in the northeast portion of the community is proposed by the Interest Group to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/40 ac to improve connection to other low-density areas.

## **Planning/Sponsor Group Recommendation:**

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

<sup>1</sup> community target established prior to 2000 census data

## **OTAY**

## Otay Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 6,804Community 2020 Target: 17,554Working Copy Population: 16,150

### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED:**

- Majority of existing population related to two large detention facilities.
- Proximity to border crossing.
- Opportunity to develop heavy industry is unique to region.
- Development potential is located on two specific plans: East Otay Mesa (commercial and industrial) and Otay Ranch (residential). Remainder of subregion is within public land.

## CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village areas reflect proposed commercial and industrial development in the East Otay Mesa specific plan.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect proposed residential development in the Otay Ranch specific plan.
- Rural areas consist of areas with sensitive biological habitats and lack of infrastructure.

- Majority of designations determined by active specific plan areas and land ownership (public/semi-public lands).
- Low densities on remaining parcels determined by lack of existing pattern of development and existing infrastructure.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

## **COUNTY ISLANDS**

## County Islands Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 1,986Community 2020 Target: 2,130Working Copy Population: 3,150

### **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOP:**

- Maintaining existing community character.
- Concerned with attempts of annexation by surrounding city (National City).

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

• Village Core and Village densities reflect the existing pattern of development, proximity to existing infrastructure, and adjacency to cities.

- *Mira Mesa*: Added growth reflects existing land use (Miramar Saddlebred), surrounding jurisdiction (City of San Diego), existing infrastructure, surrounding land uses (business park and high-density residential), and proximity to I-15.
- Greenwood: Recognized existing land use (partial jurisdiction over Greenwood Cemetery), public ownership, surrounding jurisdiction (City of San Diego), existing infrastructure, surrounding land uses (medium-density residential), and proximity to I-805.
- *Lincoln Acres*: Accommodated community character by retaining existing density on majority of parcels. Added growth on large, vacant parcels due to development potential. Recognized existing land use (La Vista Cemetery), surrounding jurisdiction (City of National City), existing infrastructure, surrounding land use (medium-density residential), and proximity to I-805.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning/Sponsor Group:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

## **RAINBOW**

## Rainbow Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 1,843 Community 2020 Target: 2,800 Working Copy Population: 3,500

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 6 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Preservation of rural lifestyle/character.
- Maintain agriculture.
- Groundwater contamination and quality.
- Traffic issues related to the California Highway Patrol checkpoint at the San Diego/Riverside County border.
- Public safety concerns on local roads.
- Fire hazards from excessive brush in the area.

## **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Semi-Rural densities applied to the areas within or adjacent to the Rainbow Valley Boulevard area.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development.
- Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure (sewer) and parcelization.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 10- and 20-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Buffers established between communities.

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## Planning Group:

• No major issues identified. Recommend Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

# **FALLBROOK**

# Fallbrook Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 39,585Community 2020 Target: 50,000Working Copy Population: 62,150

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 6 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Traffic congestion, especially through town center.
- County requirements for urban-type road standards.
- Impacts to small town community character from population growth and development.
- Preserving community character and the environment while protecting private property interests.

## **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities are located in and around the historic town center.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect existing patterns of development and are located outside the Fallbrook Public Utility District sewer service area.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure.
- A large area, northeast of the interchange between SR-76 and I-15, has been designated as a possible employment center accompanied by residential designations to accommodate multifamily housing.

#### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Higher densities maintained in areas with access to public services and infrastructure.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Environmental constraints determined density patterns in areas remote from public services. Areas within the Santa Margarita River and San Luis Rey River floodplains, not in public ownership, were designated 1 du/40 ac.
- Buffers established between communities.

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 4,538 persons

• The majority of the population increase is a direct result of increased density within the Village regional category. Although the densities proposed by the Interest Group are within the range supported by the Village category, the additional population would place further pressure on an area already dealing with traffic congestion.

## **Planning Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## PALA/PAUMA

# Pala/Pauma Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 6,156Community 2020 Target: 7,000Working Copy Population: 12,750

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 8 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintain agriculture.
- Minimize traffic related issues on State Highway 76.
- Address watershed issues (protection of the San Luis Rey Watershed).
- Provide equity mechanisms or incentives for affected property owners.
- Implement a village center/San Luis Rey Riverwalk Corridor Plan.
- Preserve rural lifestyle/character.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village densities more accurately reflect existing residential and commercial development.
- Densities were lowered in the Semi-Rural areas to serve as transition area between the Village area and the Rural areas.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns. San Luis Rey River floodplain designated at 1 du/40 ac.
- Buffers established between communities.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 10- and 20-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Identified large blocks of sensitive biological habitat (Rancho Guejito).

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 1,863 persons* 

- One area south of State Highway 76 (east of Rincon Springs) is proposed by the Interest Group to change to 1 du/40 ac.
- One area immediately south of the existing Country Town boundary (south of State Highway 76, west of Valley Center Road) is proposed to change to 1 du/80 ac.
- One area east of Valley Center Rd (south of Rincon Springs) is proposed to change to 1 du/80 ac. This area is bisected by the San Luis Rey River and is surrounded by Indian lands and public lands.
- Area within the Country Town is proposed to change to 7.3 du/ac.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified. On January 8, 2003, the Pala/Pauma Sponsor Group voted 5-0 to recommend that the Working Copy – December 2002 map, with modifications discussed with staff, be accepted for further testing and refinement.

## **BONSALL**

# Bonsall Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 8,864 Community 2020 Target: 17,217 Working Copy Population: 13,850

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 14 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Traffic regional traffic commuting through community.
- Maintaining rural character agriculture, equestrian, and semi-rural densities.
- Impacts to community character from new development.
- Lack of code enforcement and local control.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities are located in proximity to sewer and existing commercial uses and higher density.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Focused growth in areas with existing infrastructure and density.
- Environmental constraints determined density patterns San Luis Rey River floodplain (1 du/40 ac).
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 10-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

### **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 405 persons* 

- One area in the northeastern portion of the community (along W. Lilac Rd) is proposed by the Interest Group to change from 1 du/4 ac to 1 du/10 ac due to the existing development pattern, lack of infrastructure, and proximity to agriculture. Community is in support of this change.
- One area in the northeastern portion of the community (Dulin Ranch SPA) is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/40 ac due to biological sensitivity and slope. Further refinement of this area may be needed to consolidate growth in appropriate locations and reduce growth in sensitive areas.

## **Sponsor Group:**

- One area in the northern portion of the community (north of the River Village Shopping Center) is proposed by the Sponsor Group to be reduced in density from 10.9 du/ac (no specific designation given) due to slope and lack of access.
- One area in the northern portion of the community (San Luis Rey Downs Race Track) is proposed to change from 14.5 du/ac to 1 du/2 ac due to its historical value and community character.
- One area in the northeastern portion of the community (along W. Lilac Rd) is proposed to change from 1 du/4 ac to 1 du/10 ac due to the existing development pattern, lack of infrastructure, and proximity to agriculture. Interest Group is in support of this change.
- One area in the northeastern portion of the community (Dulin Ranch SPA) is proposed to change to the density designations as adopted in the specific plan.
- One area in the western portion of the community (off the intersection of Old River Rd and SR-76) is proposed to change from commercial to 1 du/2 ac due to future plans by Caltrans to alter SR-76.
- One area in the southern portion of the community (Palisades Estates) is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/10 ac due to TM in process that would add future fire access for surrounding areas.

## NORTH COUNTY METROPOLITAN

North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 28,914 Community 2020 Target: 52,967 Working Copy Population: 64,400

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 3 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Diverse area comprised of many small islands interspersed among the cities of Escondido, San Diego, San Marcos, Vista and Oceanside and large areas of steep rugged terrain and cultivated farmland.
- Varying levels of services available.
- Preservation of agriculture in areas adjacent to rapidly growing cities.
- Increased traffic throughout the sub-region.
- Annexations to adjacent cities of Escondido, San Diego, San Marcos, Vista and Oceanside.
- Possible plan boundary adjustment to add Harmony Grove area to San Dieguito Community Plan area. This issue will be discussed in the San Dieguito Planning area presentation. The population listed above includes the Harmony Grove area.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities are located in those areas primarily west of I-15 where services, including access to public transportation, are available.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Buffers established between communities when possible.
- Preserved land with rugged terrain and sensitive biological habitats by maintaining 1du/20-ac and 1du/40-ac densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Increased densities adjacent to proposed transit center and in areas surrounded by higher densities in the adjacent cities.

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

# Planning/Sponsor Group Recommendation:

• No planning/sponsor group representation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

# **HIDDEN MEADOWS**

North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 6,329 Community 2020 Target: 10,000 Working Copy Population: 11,650

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 5 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Preservation of community character.
- Possible change in planning area boundary with Valley Center planning area.
- Traffic elimination of SC990 to maintain current circulation pattern.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character.
- Lack of riding and hiking trails within the community.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities are limited with the majority of uses serving the community located in the adjacent city of Escondido. There are numerous specific plans within this plan area. Specific plans such as Lawrence Welk Resort and Champagne Gardens provide services primarily for visitors to the area.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Buffers established between communities.
- Preserved land with rugged terrain and sensitive biological habitats by maintaining 20- and 40-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

# **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

# **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified. On August 22, 2002, the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group recommended the Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters

## TWIN OAKS

# North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 2,501 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 2,142 Working Copy Population: 3,750

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 21 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Preservation of rural lifestyle.
- Maintaining agriculture.
- Impacts to community character from new development in adjacent cities.
- Traffic regional traffic commuting through community.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

# **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses for the community are located in the adjacent cities of Vista and San Marcos.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between communities.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 1du/10-ac and 1du/20-ac densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 288 persons

- Two areas in the southern portion of the community are proposed by the Interest Group to change from 1 du/10 ac (Semi-Rural) to 1 du/20 ac (Rural Lands) due to lack of existing parcelization and biological resources.
- One area in the central portion of the community is proposed to change from 1 du/4 ac to 1 du/10 ac and 1 du/20 ac due to lack of existing parcelization.

## **Sponsor Group:**

• No major issues identified. On August 22, 2002, the Twin Oaks Sponsor Group recommended the Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

subarea does not include group quarters

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> community target established prior to 2000 census data

## SAN DIEGUITO

# San Dieguito Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 12,527 Community 2020 Target: 37,506 Working Copy Population<sup>1</sup>: 34,050

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 7 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintaining rural estate character.
- Impact of vested specific plan areas.
- Traffic primarily regional thru-traffic and traffic generated from locally developing specific plan areas.

## CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses in Rancho Santa Fe and the Harmony Grove village (potential for Mixed Use Overlay Zone in the core of Harmony Grove).
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing development pattern and comprise most of the area. Undeveloped Semi-Rural areas occur within Harmony Grove and within the existing specific plan areas.
- Rural areas are characterized by steep slopes, high biological sensitivity (Elfin Forest) and the riparian corridors and floodplains that transverse the community planning area.

- Land uses primarily reflect the existing, essentially built out community or vested specific plan areas.
- Additional density accommodated in the Harmony Grove village while key elements of the rural character are maintained.
- Natural resources and steep slopes protected with lower density including Escondido Creek and San Dieguito River.
- Land available for possible agricultural use on the edge of the Harmony Grove village.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 320 persons

• Indicates lowest rural density in the Elfin Forest area (1 du/40 ac).

# **Planning Group:**

• No formal proposal to date, but exploring higher Semi-Rural densities primarily on the northern border of Elfin Forest to reduce property owner motivation to annex to San Marcos.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> population does not include Harmony Grove area; currently included in the North County Metropolitan subregional planning area

# **VALLEY CENTER**

# Valley Center Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 15,639 Community 2020 Target<sup>1</sup>: 45,853 Working Copy Population: 38,300

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 50 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintain rural lifestyle/character.
- Traffic impacts to the local road network from development and surrounding Indian gaming facilities.
- How to preserve community character and the environment while protecting private property rights.
- Absence of equity mechanisms or incentives for affected property owners.
- Lack of local road connectivity.
- Lack of a municipal sewer system.
- Lack of affordable housing.
- County requirements for urban-style road standards.

#### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Higher residential densities (7.3 and 4.3) are limited to the Village Residential areas (northern and southern Country Towns).
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development.
- Semi-Rural areas serve as a transition between Village Residential areas and Rural Lands.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between adjacent communities.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 10- and 20-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Village Core and Village densities are designated within the historic town center providing an opportunity for municipal sewer system.

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 4,395 persons* 

- Apply the Semi-Rural (1 du/ac) designation north, west and east of the existing Country Town boundaries.
- Apply the Village Residential (7.3 du/ac) designation to the areas west and east of Cole Grade Road.
- Apply Rural Lands (1 du/40 ac) designation to the following areas: 1) the northwestern portions of the planning area (including Weaver Mountain); 2) the southwestern portions of the planning area (west of Red Mountain); 3) the Upper Hellhole area and the southern portions of Paradise Mountain (south of Paradise Mountain Road).
- Apply the Semi-Rural (1 du/10 ac) designation to the area between the southern and northern Country towns (north of Woods Valley Ranch and south of Valley Center Road).

# **Planning Group:**

• The Valley Center Planning Group was unable to reach a majority vote to either accept or reject the Working Copy – December 2002 map. However, the Planning Group did pass a motion to accept a map provided that a Purchase of Development Rights/Transfer of Development Rights Program was in place concurrent with the adoption of General Plan 2020.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## **RAMONA**

# Ramona Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 33,407 Community 2020 Target: 52,043 Working Copy Population: 53,500

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 21 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintenance of Rural Character.
- Traffic Congestion on Highway 67 and within the town center.
- Existing infrastructure deficit; primarily roads and sewer.
- Protection of the Ramona Grasslands.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses in the town center, where services are expected to be available.
- Gradually decreasing Semi-Rural densities radiating from the town reflect existing development patterns and provide areas for future lower-density development and agricultural uses.
- Rural areas characterized by significant biological, topographical, and groundwater constraints and other natural resource issues.

- Additional capacity in this community planning area due to proximity to western incorporated areas and subsequent infrastructure and location within the County Water Authority (mostly).
- Varied land uses including higher density residential in the town center.
- Mixed Use Overlay Zone may ultimately be applied during town center workshops.
- Semi-rural areas supporting town center.
- Protection of natural resource areas.

• Development of a preservation plan for the grasslands is underway.

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 17,247 persons

- Indicates some substantially higher density locations in Village Core.
- Indicates higher densities in a large area of Village and Semi-Rural lands.

# **Planning Group:**

- Planning group and DPLU have worked together to develop a land use
  distribution recommendation that is mutually agreeable in most areas with a
  population capacity that is very near to the community population target.
  Some density recommendations currently reflected on the Working Copy –
  December 2002 map have been suggested for reconsideration by the planning
  group.
- The Ramona Grasslands Project is still in the conceptual phase and must be further developed before specific recommendations may be applicable.

# GENERAL PLAN 2020 Planning Commission Schedule

# **DAY 3 • FEBRUARY 14, 2003**

Planning Area Subarea

Valle de Oro

Sweetwater

Spring Valley

Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills/Harbison Canyon

Lakeside/Pepper Drive-Bostonia

Alpine

Mountain Empire

Tecate

Jamul-Dulzura

## VALLE DE ORO

# Valle de Oro Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 40,035Community 2020 Target: 42,850Working Copy Population: 42,850

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 2 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintain general plan main development pattern.
- Maintain slope standards.
- Traffic regional traffic commuting through community.
- Group target is flexible to assure that it changes with refinements to the model.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses reflect the current patterns of development and growth.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing uses and existing patterns of development.
- Much of the area's land use is determined by existing specific plans.
- The majority of the area in the Public/Semi-Public category is preserve.

- The community is generally either built, preserved or in a specific plan area.
- Recognized existing patterns of development and growth.
- Allowed some growth based on infrastructure and existing parcelization.
- Environmental constraints determined density patterns in the Sweetwater River area.

# **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

# **Planning Group:**

• Recommended changing open space areas from a designation of Public/Semi-public to a new Open Space designation.

## **SWEETWATER**

# Sweetwater Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 12,951Community 2020 Target: 16,303Working Copy Population: 15,250

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 10 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Impacts to community character from rapid development in the City of Chula Vista.
- Environmental impacts from the alignment and construction of the SR-125 toll road.
- Community desire to be removed from the City of Chula Vista's sphere of influence.
- Annexations have physically divided the community and resulting development has ignored community character.
- As the number of commuters in surrounding jurisdictions has increased, local roads have become congested with regional traffic.

## CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- The traditional services provided by a village core are located in the adjacent city of Chula Vista.
- Village Core and Village densities reflect existing commercial designations and development patterns.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development.
- Rural area consists of floodplain and sensitive habitat along the Sweetwater River.

## **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Recognized existing patterns of development and land uses. Very few changes in density were made because the residential areas are largely developed.
- Recognized existing land ownership over half of the community planning area is designated public/semi-public lands.
- Low densities were assigned to lands within the rural area surrounding the Sweetwater River.

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

# **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

# **Planning Group:**

• No major issues identified.

## SPRING VALLEY

# Spring Valley Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 59,324 Community 2020 Target: 69,292 Working Copy Population: 67,700

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 6 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Impacts on community character and public services from increased development of low-income housing.
- Incompatible mix of land uses undesirable commercial uses (auto repair, liquor stores, etc.) adjacent to residential uses.
- Lack of recreational parks and open space.
- Overwhelming feeling of neglect by the County lack of code enforcement.
- Community's desire to incorporate.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities reflect existing commercial designations and development patterns.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development.
- Rural area contains steep slopes and is adjacent to federal preserve.

### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

• Recognized existing patterns of development and land uses. Very few changes in density were made because the community is largely developed.

# **Interest Group:**

• No major issues identified.

# Planning Group:

• Desire to retain existing general plan.

## CREST/DEHESA/HARBISON CANYON/GRANITE HILLS

Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 9,426Community 2020 Target: 12,000Working Copy Population: 11,000

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 5 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Traffic speeding issues on wider roads and poorly engineered private roads.
- Impacts to community character from Sycuan Casino traffic, visual façade, lighting and groundwater concerns.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character. Incompatible development in neighboring City of El Cajon higher density.
- Concern over decreasing groundwater and high concentration of nitrates.

### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and parcelization.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns topography isolates the four subregions.
- Recognized existing patterns of development and lack of infrastructure.
- Recognized small commercial cores with future growth planned adjacent to core.

## **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 179 persons* 

- Several areas in the central portion of the community are proposed by the Interest Group to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/40 ac due to sensitive biological habitats (all within the MSCP pre-approved mitigation area), steep slopes and lack of infrastructure and development pattern.
- One area in the northern portion of the community (Avocado Groves) is proposed to change from 1 du/4 ac to 1 du/40 ac due to sensitive biological habitats and steep slopes.

## **Planning Group:**

• One area in the central portion of the community (adjacent to Crest) is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/2 ac due to public request and adjacency to existing development pattern.

## LAKESIDE/PEPPER DRIVE-BOSTONIA

Lakeside Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 72,370Community 2020 Target: 85,754Working Copy Population: 87,400

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 7 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Retain rural character, which means preserving or enhancing the following:
  - 1. Undeveloped areas in the northern section of the community and within the Lakeside MSCP Archipelago
  - 2. Existing semi-rural neighborhoods (Moreno Valley, Eucalyptus Hills, Blossom Valley, and Upper Rios Canyon) and existing agriculture areas in El Monte Valley
  - 3. Open space buffers along community boundaries
  - 4. Commercial businesses that reflect rural character
  - 5. Environmental resources (lake, river valleys and reservoir)
- Contain higher-density development within existing urbanized areas.
- Retain and enhance Lakeside's historic town center.
- Retain or expand business opportunities while reducing visual and other impacts associated with commercial/industrial development.
- Reduce impacts of regional traffic (Highway 67), which divides the community.

#### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

Village Core and Village densities are contained within the southwest portion
of the community, which includes the densely developed Pepper DriveBostonia area. Lakeside's Village and Village Core are substantially built-out,
and for that reason minimal change is proposed to this portion of Lakeside's
land use plan. Higher densities were only applied to select parcels; additional
high-density development would only be possible through a redevelopment
program.

- Semi-Rural densities are located in established neighborhoods and reflect existing development patterns. Semi-rural densities were retained in Moreno Valley and in El Monte Valley, which contains land subject to dam inundation or agricultural contracts. Undeveloped parcels are limited and typically contain steep slopes and poor infrastructure. Semi-rural densities were applied to the Lakeside MSCP Archipelago, which contains slopes and significant biological habitats.
- Rural Lands were primarily located within the northern section of Lakeside, which is located outside the CWA. This area has rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, poor access, and a lack of existing water/sewer service.
   Rural Lands are also applied to the San Diego River basin, public land, and land containing a combination of very steep slopes and significant biological habitats.

### Land Use Distribution Criteria:

- Existing development patterns and parcelization.
- Infrastructure constraints: road networks and sewer/water lines.
- Environmental and physical constraints steep and very steep slopes, water bodies and reservoir locations, significant biological resources, and floodplains.
- Safety issues (dam inundation).
- Buffers established between communities.
- Agricultural contracts / preservation at 1 du/10 ac densities.

## **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal increases population by approximately 235 persons* 

- Proposes higher density development in lower Eucalptus Hills, one of Lakeside's semi-rural neighborhoods.
- Proposes Village densities along the Lakeside/Alpine border.
- Proposes higher densities within and around Riverway Specific Plan.
- Proposes to expand semi-rural development in the northern section of the community in an area with poor access and services.
- Proposes Village densities within a portion of the Lakeside MSCP Archipelago (an area with steep slopes and highly significant biological habitats).

## **Planning Group:**

- Proposes elimination of High Meadows Ranch (SPA).
- Proposes reduced density on two properties "hard-lined" during MSCP: (A) 1 du/acre to 1 du/2 acre, and (B) 1 du/2 acre to 1 du/40 acre. Both contain steep or very steep slopes and highly significant biological resources.
- Proposes to retain existing density (1 du/acre versus 1 du/4 acre) within the Lakeside MSCP Archipelago. The group's rationale is that density reductions will reduce land values, thus making the County subject to a lawsuit.
- Proposes to retain existing density (1 du/4 acre versus 1 du/20 acre) in a portion of El Monte Valley, which contains very steep slopes and significant biological resources.
- The quantity and location of commercial/industrial use within Lakeside remain a major issue that will be addressed once the distribution of residential use is determined.
- Requests that the General Plan designation be changed to match the Zoning regulation in several sections of the community where the zoning effectively produces a lower density.

## **ALPINE**

# Alpine Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 16,681 Community 2020 Target: 27,369 Working Copy Population: 30,200

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 17 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Forest Conservation Initiative Issue planning group advances the idea of planning for private areas affected by FCI, which is due to sunset in 2010.
- Planning group does not agree with GP2020 Population modeling/methodology and believes the area will never achieve the target numbers without additional planning for FCI areas.
- Planning group requested additional housing opportunities and commercial/industrial opportunities should be planned to support the Village.

#### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

### **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village Core and Village densities and uses for the community are located in and around the historic country town center along Alpine Boulevard between Tavern Road and Cole Grade Road. Village areas extend to areas south of the town to reflect existing parcelization, schools, and traffic nodes (Tavern and South Grade). Growth would predominantly occur in the Village and Semi-Rural densities due to sewer availability in and adjacent to the Alpine Sanitation District.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing 2- to 4-acre parcelization and existing patterns of development.
- Rural areas consist of areas with steep terrain, sensitive biological habitats, a lack of infrastructure, parcelization, and adjacent to National Forests lands outside of the County Water Authority boundary.

#### **Land Use Distribution Criteria:**

- Recognized existing patterns of development.
- Available infrastructure determined density patterns.
- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between communities.
- Preserved land on steep slopes by maintaining 10-, 20-, and 40-acre densities.

### **ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal increases the population by approximately 1,985 persons* 

• The Interest Group proposes to raise densities in areas the planning group considers to be physically constrained by either existing development patterns or natural features. Conflicts between the Interest Group recommendations and the planning group direction are in raised densities in areas to the east and north of the existing Village, and the Interest Group recommends lower densities in the Wrights Field than the planning group.

# **Planning Group:**

 Recommend Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

# **TECATE**

# Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population<sup>1</sup>: 156 Community 2020 Target<sup>2</sup>: 1,000 Working Copy Population: 450

# KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 1 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:

- Reinforce existing commercial and industrial core at the border.
- Maintain commercial and industrial areas.
- Impacts to community character from Tecate, Mexico.
- Traffic regional traffic commuting through community.
- The Rural Lands category and residential designation do not respect the existing border character.

#### **CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:**

### **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- Village and Semi-Rural densities and uses for the community are located in areas adjacent to the City of Tecate, Mexico.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing industrial and commercial uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Village/Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Rural areas consist of areas with rugged terrain, sensitive biological habitats, and lack of infrastructure and existing parcelization.

- Environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Buffers established between community and Rural lands to the north.
- Recognized existing patterns of development and existing industry and commercial uses.

## **Interest Group:**

*Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 70 persons* 

The Interest Group map proposed a change from 1 du/40 ac at the border, and north to Potrero, to 1 du/80 ac due to biological resources.

# **Sponsor Group:**

• Possible recommendation of Working Copy – December 2002 map to be accepted for further testing and refinement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> subarea does not include group quarters <sup>2</sup> community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

## JAMUL/DULZURA

# Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 9,208Community 2020 Target: 18,641Working Copy Population: 22,550

# **KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED AT 14 COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND MEETINGS:**

- Maintain historical character.
- Maintain the rural character of the subregion.
- Preserve environmental resources.
- Traffic/border issues are of concern to the community.

### CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA USED IN CREATION OF MAP:

## **Regional Categories (Structure):**

- No Village Core densities. Community utilizes adjacent Valle de Oro Village Core areas.
- Village densities are located adjacent to SR-94 on lots that are currently built inside the County Water Authority.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing patterns of development both inside and outside the County Water Authority boundary.
- Rural areas are located in areas with steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats and areas dependent on groundwater.

- Densities determined by existing parcelization and size of parcels outside of the County Water Authority.
- Transitioning of development away from the village was key to establishing a pattern of development within the County Water Authority.
- Environmental constraints (slope, lack of water, Multiple Species Conservation Program) determined densities outside of the County Water Authority.

## **Interest Group:**

Interest Group proposal lowers population by approximately 964 persons

• Several areas outside of the County Water Authority are proposed by the Interest Group to change from 1 du/40 ac to 1 du/80 ac to preserve environmental resources.

# **Planning Group:**

- Retain existing general plan.
- Would like to investigate 'groundtruthing' of actual buildable land within the subregion before accepting a new map.